



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/596,791	03/09/2008	Marc Kuttler	149459-110070	1489
25207	7590	06/10/2011		
BARNES & THORNBURG LLP			EXAMINER	
Suite 1700			BUCKLEY, AUDREA	
3475 Piedmont Road, N.E.				
Atlanta, GA 30305-2954			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1617	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/10/2011	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patent-at@btlaw.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No. 10/596,791	Applicant(s) KUTTLER ET AL.
	Examiner AUDREA BUCKLEY	Art Unit 1617

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 24 May 2011 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
 b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
 (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____

Claim(s) objected to: _____

Claim(s) rejected: 1-11

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: Regarding the submitted "Elektron WE43" evidence, this literature cannot be entered at this time since it is not clear and readable.

/AJB/

/Richard Schnizer/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1635

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejections of record. Applicant canceled claim 1 and amended its dependent claims to depend from new claim 12. Claim 12 encompasses more limitations and a different scope than the product examined in claim 1 in the rejection of record. As such, the amendment is not entered since it would require further search and consideration. In addition, the newly presented claims 13-19 would require further search and consideration also. For instance, all proposed claims depend from new claim 12 which includes the limitation of "a second coating" and the limitation of "a third coating". The previously examined claims did not include these limitations.

Applicant argues that the Tormala reference does not teach the creation of structures having coatings with non-progressive degradation profiles. In reply, it is first noted that Applicant's arguments are directed to a method of making rather than the statutory class (product) of the claimed invention. Secondly, Applicant's arguments are directed to limitations not included in the proposed claims. Finally, Applicant's arguments are not persuasive since they are directed to claims which have not been entered.

Applicant concludes (page 10 of Remarks filed 5/24/2011) that the ordinary artisan would not have been motivated to combine the polymer coatings of metallic stent materials with the progressive degradation zones of Tormala to create the instant invention. Similarly, Applicant concludes that there is no motivation for combining the Anderson reference with the Tormala and Steinke reference. Finally, Applicant concludes that one would not have been motivated to combine the Pinchuk reference with the teachings of Tormala and Steinke. In reply, these positions have been fully considered but are not persuasive since reasons for Applicant's conclusions have not been presented.